

96-98

From: James Andrew Lichtenwalter
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 8:40 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

James Andrew Lichtenwalter (lichtenwalter@ems.att.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I know that next Thursday is a very big day for both you and the entire telecommunications industry.

I just want to share with you my thoughts as an employee of AT&T. If the long distance companies are not allowed to lease the local networks from the Bells there would be no way for them to provide local service. And the Bells would continue to have their monopoly.

Yes, AT&T does plan on purchasing switches so it is not dependent on the Bells forever, but it takes time and money to do this. In today's economy raising that type of capital is not an easy thing to do.

I feel that if AT&T is not allowed to lease these parts of the network then in effect AT&T would not be able to provide local service and competition. I also feel that there would be lay-offs in an industry that already has had its share of them.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

James Andrew Lichtenwalter

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 192.128.166.68
Remote IP address: 192.128.166.68

From: ZimFam83@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 10:51 PM
Subject: FCC meeting Feb. 20th

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,
As an average hard working Amercian, who has lost a lot of hard earned money
in
the stock market. I would like to ask you to be fair to the CLECs , and not
change
the rules that invited my investment. Allowing competition in the
communication
sector will help drive our countries technology to a higher level.

Thank you,
The Zimmerman Family - Lawton,
Oklahoma

CC: ZimFam83@aol.com

From: Andrew Pachmayer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 7:59 PM
Subject: UNE-P Rates

Chairman Michael Powell
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Andrew Pachmayer and I am a first level manager with SBC in Michigan. I manage 20 technicians in a Central Office environment.

I am writing to you today regarding the upcoming decisions you have about the UNE-P rates.

I realize that as I write this it will appear that I have a bias towards the RBOCs based on the fact that I work for one. However, I hope to illustrate my points not only as an employee of an RBOC but also as a consumer.

When I began working in the telecommunications industry I had a very basic understanding as to what it takes to provide dial tone to consumers. Since then I have a much greater understanding and appreciation of each individual component that is involved in providing the consumer with dial tone.

One of my biggest concerns is that the average consumer does not know what it takes to provide dial tone. I have read numerous editorials from individuals that try and claim that competition is finally working in the telecommunications industry. Yet from where I sit I cannot comprehend how competition exists when a company is forced to lease its line to a competitor that does not have to invest any capital in the service. It is still the RBOCs responsibility to maintain the service. In most industries, if a company wants to re-badge a product to sell as their own, they have to negotiate an agreement with the producer of the service so it is beneficial for both parties. This currently does not happen in the telecommunications industry based on the UNE-P structure.

I would like to point out that I am in favor of competition as I feel it will create innovation in the industry. It will also ultimately benefit consumers through not only lower phone bills, but also with better phone service. However, to be able to have innovation in an industry the competition has to be real. The only way this will occur is when CLECs have to make investments into the network in order to provide service. More investment into a network means real options for consumers, more options for consumers mean more innovation in the network, and more innovation in the network means better service for the consumer.

Here are a few questions I would like to ask based on the current UNE-P structure.

1. What incentive does a RBOC have to invest in new technology, for example

fiber to the home, if they will have to turn around and lease their lines to a CLEC at a regulated lease rate?

2. If a consumer chooses to leave a RBOC for a competitor, why is the RBOC required to vacate the facilities within three days, yet if a consumer chooses to leave a CLEC to go back to an RBOC, the CLEC is allowed to keep leasing the line whether it is being used or not?

One example I have is where a small college chose to come back to SBC and the CLEC did not release the facilities back to SBC until we had placed new plant into the ground in order to give the customer service. The UNE-P shows states that as long as the CLEC leases the line they do not have to have service on it and this shows me that if a CLEC can afford to lease a line without actually selling a service on it that the rate is too low.

3. How would you explain to consumers of the RBOCs that are frustrated with their service repair durations when we have to work on our competitors lines first to maintain parity? What other industry is set up where a business cannot work on their own customers services first?

4. Finally how will the FCC respond, if based on the current market conditions that further layoffs are necessary by the RBOCs, which in turn would reduce the workforce of the CLECs? Are the RBOCs going to be fined because they had to let people go due to declining revenue, which in turn could cause longer durations to consumers of the CLECs?

I know that there is a lot of information out there and parties involved when it comes to determining the proper regulatory environment for the telecommunications industry, but please try and consider both the short-term benefits as well as the long-term benefits for the consumer and the industry. I know that I am not an expert but I do feel that real competition needs to occur in order for the industry to rebound. This will ultimately lead to better service and deals for consumers.

Thank you for your time.

Andrew C. Pachmayer
apachmayer@hotmail.com

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: Tim Peters
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 8:18 AM
Subject: Fw: Keep Line Sharing As Is

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-98
RECEIVED

-----Original Message-----

FEB 26 2003

From: Jen Aust
Date: Friday, February 14, 2003 08:09:55 AM
To: Ecfshelp@fcc.gov
Subject: Keep Line Sharing As Is

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Please don't take away the line sharing rules that are in place. Doing this will hurt tens of thousands of consumers, shareholders, and startup business that need this to keep their ships afloat. I'm in Rochester NY where technology is as common as snow and people continue to lose jobs daily (Kodak, Xerox, Frontier, Global Crossing) I don't care what the government says. I see it every day. Your decision is crucial to thousands of peoples financial stability. Please take this into consideration before acting. The pockets of the huge Bells are deep enough, support the little guy for a change. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Timothy Peters
tp00@rochester.rr.com

96 98

IncrediMail - Email has finally evolved - [Click Here](#)

RECEIVED

FEB 26 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Johney H. Royer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Feb 14, 2003 10:42 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Johney H. Royer (johney_royer@yahoo.com) writes:

Keep Line Sharing

Keep UNE-P

Leave DSL alone - I paid for the lines of the monopolies - I get to decide who sells me service.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1

Remote host: 12.227.129.203

Remote IP address: 12.227.129.203